

REMARKS

Summary Of The Office Action & Formalities

Status of Claims

Claims 1-17 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 1-6, which were withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement, and amending claims 14 and 17. No new matter is added.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8, 9, 13 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Rejections

Claims 7, 10-12, 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by George et al. (US 2002/0195931).

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 7, 10-12, 14, 15 And 17 In View Of George et al. (US 2002/0195931).

In rejecting claims 7, 10-12, 14, 15 and 17 in view of George et al. (US 2002/0195931), the grounds of rejection state:

Regarding Claims 7, 10, 14 and 17, George et al. disclose a thick film electroluminescent light emitting device having a plurality of layers where in Fig. 4, it is disclosed a first electrode layer 102, a light emitting layer 104 having phosphor particles 106 causing protrusions in the light emitting layer 104, at least one layer including a second electrode layer 204 where the first

electrode layer and the at least one other layer conform to the protrusions in the light emitting layer 104.

Office Action at pages 2-3.

Moreover, in response to Applicant's last Amendment, the Examiner states that "the claim language of claim 7, does not say that the phosphor particles should be protruding from both sides of [a] light emitting layer." Office action at page 2.

On March 14, 2007, Applicant's representative, Mr. Raja Saliba, telephoned the Examiner to discuss the current grounds of rejection. During that interview, Mr. Saliba explained how claim 7 requires phosphor particles to protrude from the light emitting layer into the insulating layer and the transparent electrode layer. Also, given the recited location of the light emitting layer, claim 7 necessarily requires the phosphor particles to protrude from both sides of the light emitting layer. Regarding claims 14 and 17, Mr. Saliba explained that these claims require a proportion of the phosphor particles to cause protrusions in a top surface and a bottom surface of the light emitting layer.

Mr. Saliba further explained that the applied reference, George et al., clearly does not disclose or suggest phosphor particles protruding from both sides of a light emitting layer. Rather, as shown in Fig. 4, phosphor particles 106 protrude from only one side of the organic binder layer 104.

The Examiner agreed with the foregoing differences and indicated that he would withdraw the present rejection following Applicant's submission of the present response. Accordingly, such action is kindly requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Raja N. Saliba
Registration No. 43,078

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 10, 2007